MAR 5 1928

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1927.

No. 285.

HOLLAND FURNITURE COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

PERKINS GLUE COMPANY,
Respondent.

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT.

GORHAM CROSBY,
Counsel for Respondent.

S. MONTAGUE WARE, JR.,
of Counsel for Respondent.

March 2, 1928.

GAULD & ACKERMAN, INC., 143 LIBERTY STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Brief Statement of the Case	1
Starch and the Meaning of Viscosity, Degeneration and Water Absorptiveness	10
The Requirements of a Glue for the Wood Panel or Furniture Veneer Industry	12
Perkins' Early Work at Poplar Bluff	14
Perkins' Failure at Cairo in 1905	18
Perkins' Failure at Wilts	18
Perkins' Failure at Frosts in 1906	18
Perkins' Failure at First at the Singer Company's Plant, 1906	19
The Specification of the Patent in Suit	20
The So-Called Tests for the Base	26
The Practical Tests for Veneer Glue	29
The Prior Art	30
The Gerson & Sachse and Virneisel Patents	30
Dornemann French Patent	34
Higgins U. S. Patent 579,827	37
Brueder German Patent	38
Gerard Belgian Patent and "Apparatine" Publications	40
Marsden U. S. Patent 376,445	44
The New Perkins Glue was not Obvious from the Prior Art	45
Perkins' Glue Has Revolutionized the Veneering Industry	47

PAGE

The Solva Co. Litigation ____ 48
Judge Sanborn's Decision at Final Hearing in the Solva Case ____ 50
Opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Solva Case with Comments ____ 55
The C. C. A. in the Solva Case did not Limit the Glue Product Claims to the So-called Tests for the Base ____ 76
The Solva Petition for Rehearing ____ 79
Judge Sanborn's Memorandum on Entry of Final Decree ____ 81

The Disclaimer as to Process Claims and The Glue Base Claims ____ 87
Judge Sessions' Decision in the West Michigan Co. and Hood & Wright Cases ____ 88
The Nature of the Infringement in the Case at Bar ____ 91
Defendant's Base is Degenerated ____ 92
Judge Sessions' Opinion for Interlocutory Decree in the Case at Bar ____ 97
Judge Cooper's Opinion in the Standard Furniture Co. Case ____ 101
Judge Geiger's Decision in the Wisconsin Cases ____ 105
Judge Geiger Misinterprets the Solva Decision ____ 106
Judge Geiger Misconstrues the Product Claims ____ 107
Judge Geiger Misapplies the Disclaimer ____ 108
Judge Geiger Misconstrues the Result in the Solva Case ____ 109
Judge Geiger had an Erroneous Idea Regarding Anticipation ____ 111

The Decision of the 2nd C. C. A. in the Standard Case is Likewise Erroneous ____ 114
The Decision of the 7th C. C. A. in the Wisconsin Cases is also Erroneous ____ 119
Judge Sessions' Reopening of the Case at Bar and Reversal of his Interlocutory Decree ____ 121

Argument.

PAGE

The Product Claims are Neither Anticipated nor Limited by the Prior Art and Defendant's Doings are not Justified by the Prior Art 122

Perkins' Change in Water Proportions was not a Mere Difference in Degree 128

A Prior Patent to Anticipate or Limit one of Later Date Must Do so Without Assistance From the Latter 130

Under the Law the Product Claims Should Not be Limited to the Process Described 132

The 7th C. C. A. in the Solva Case Did Not Limit the Product Claims to the Two-Step Process 136

If the Product Claims are Valid, Defendant Infringes .. 138

Plaintiff's Failure to Appeal from Judge Sanborn's Reasoning Has No Bearing 140

The Disclaimer as to Process Claims Does Not Limit or Affect the Product Claims 28, 30, 31 141

The Inconsistency of Defendant's Position 150

The Absurdity of Defendant's Argument with Respect to the So-called Tests for the Base 152

Defendant's Argument with Respect to the Disclaimer, etc. 164

Conclusion 172

TABLE OF CASES.

PAGES

American Co. vs. Mesta Co., 18 Fed. (2nd), 538 156
Asperin Case, 171 Fed., 887, 889 (affirmed 179 Fed., 701) 33, 131
Atlantic Co. vs. Hulings, 21 Fed., 519 165
Baker vs. Refractories, 253 Fed., 741 (3rd C. C. A.) 135
Bene vs. Jeantet, 129 U. S., 683; 32 L. Ed., 803 155
Bracewell vs. Passaic, 107 Fed., 469 165
Bresnahan vs. Tripp Co., 102 Fed., 899, 900; 43 C. C. A., 48 (1st C. C. A.) 7, 133
Carnegie vs. Cambria, 185 U. S, 403 145
Clarke vs. Deere & Mansur, 80 Fed., 534, 537; 25 C. C. A., 619 (7th C. C. A.) 141
Cochrane vs. Badische, 111 U. S., 293; 28 L. Ed., 433, 310 154
Cohn vs. U. S. Corset Co., 93 U. S., 366; 23 L. Ed., 907 130
Dunn vs. Toronto, 259 Fed., 258 (6th C. C. A.) 135
Dunbar vs. Meyers, 94 U. S., 187; 24 L. Ed., 34 165
Eagleton Co. vs. West Co., 111 U. S., 490, 28 L. Ed., 493 159
Eames vs. Andrews, 122 U. S., 44; 30 L. Ed., 1064 125
Eibel Process Co. vs. Paper Co., 261 U. S., 66, 67; 67 L. Ed., 534 129
Evans vs. Suess, 83 Fed., 706, 709; 28 C. C. A., 24 (7th C. C. A.) 9, 141
General Electric vs. Laco Co., 233 Fed., 96, 103, 105; 147 C. C. A., 166 (2nd C. C. A.) 127, 135
Giant Powder Co. vs. Powder Works, 98 U. S., 126; 25 L. Ed., 77 167
Graham vs. Earl, 92 Fed., 155, 158; 34 C. C. A., 267 (9th C. C. A.) 8, 147, 165
Hess Bright vs. Standard, 177 Fed., 437 126
Incandescent Lamp Case, 159 U. S., 683, 474; 40 L. Ed., 221, 224 155

PAGES

Johns Pratt Co. vs. Snow, 212 Fed., 173, 176 ..... 33, 130
Kuehmsted vs. Elberfeld Co., 179 Fed., 701; 103 C. C. A., 243 (7th C. C. A.) 127, 134
Los Angeles Co. vs. Aeolian Co., 143 Fed., 880, 885; 75 C. C. A., 88 (9th C. C. A.) 7, 133
Ludwigs vs. Payson Mfg. Co., 206 Fed., 60, 64; 124 C. C. A., 194 (7th C. C. A.) 33, 131
Mast Foos & Co. vs. Dempster Co., 82 Fed., 327, 333; 27 C. C. A., 191 (8th C. C. A.) 7, 132
Matheson vs. Campbell, 78 Fed., 910, 917 155
McCarty vs. Lehigh, 160 U. S., 110, 116; 40 L. Ed., 358, 361 ..... 9, 132
McMichael & Wildman vs. Ruth, 128 Fed., 706; 63 C. C. A., 304 (3rd C. C. A.) 126
Michigan vs. Consolidated Co., 67 Fed., 121 159
Minerals Separation Case, 250 U. S., 336; 63 L. Ed., 1019 155
National Co. vs. American Co., 53 Fed., 367, 370; 3 C. C. A., 359 (3rd C. C. A.) 7
Naylor vs. Alsop, 168 Fed., 911, 919; 94 C. C. A., 315 (8th C. C. A.) 127, 138
O'Reilly vs. Morse, 15 How., 62, 112, 121; 14 L. Ed., 601, 623, 627 ..... 154, 165
Packing Cases, 105 U. S., 566; 26 L. Ed., 1172 167
Permutit Co. vs. Harvey Co., 279 Fed., 713, 721 (2nd C. C. A.) 8
Railway Co. vs. Sayles, 97 U. S., 554, 564; 24 L. Ed., 1053, 1057 159
Rubber Co. vs. Goodyear, 76 U. S., 788; 19 L. Ed., 566 ..... 9, 145
Russell vs. Kern, 69 Fed., 94; 16 C. C. A., 154 (7th C. C. A.) 140
Sessions vs. Romadka, 145 U. S., 29 ..... 144, 145
Seymour vs. Osborne, 78 U. S., 516 125
Steward vs. American Co., 215 U. S., 161 159
Toledo Co. vs. Computing Co., 208 Fed., 410; 125 C. C. A., 622 (7th C. C. A.) 129

PAGES

Tyler vs. Boston, 7 Wall., 327; 19 L. Ed., 93 155
Warren vs. Owosso, 166 Fed., 309; 92 C. C. A., 227 125
Western vs. Ansonia, 114 U. S., 447; 29 L. Ed., 210 168
Westinghouse vs. Great Northern, 88 Fed., 258, 263; 31 C. C. A., 525 (2nd C. C. A.) 126
Westinghouse vs. Saranac, 108 Fed., 226 125
White vs. Dunbar, 119 U. S., 47; 30 L. Ed., 305 172
United States M. P. Co. vs. Hewitt Co., 236 Fed., 739, 742; 150 C. C. A., 71 (7th C. C. A.) 8, 149

DECISIONS ON THE PERKINS PATENT IN SUIT.

Perkins Glue Co. vs. Solva Waterproof Glue Co., et al. (D. C.), 223 Fed., 792 (1915) 50
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Solva Water Proof Glue Co., et al. (7th C. C. A.), 251 Fed., 64 (1918) 55
Perkins Glue Co. vs. West Michigan Co., et al. (D. C.), 279 Fed., 454 (1920) 88
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Holland Furniture Co., et al. (D. C.), 279 Fed., 457 (1921) 97
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Standard Furniture Co., et al. (D. C.), 279 Fed., 458 (1922) 101
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Gould Mfg. Co., et al. (D. C.), 280 Fed., 728 (1922) 105
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Standard Furniture Co., et al. (2nd C. C. A.), 287 Fed., 109 (1923) 114
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Crandall Panel Co., et al. (D. C.), 294 Fed., 135 (1923) .....
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Gould Mfg. Co., et al. (7th C. C. A.), 292 Fed., 596 (1923) 119
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Holland Furn. Co. (6th C. C. A.), 18 Fed. (2nd), 387 (1927) .....